

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JACOB S. SILVERMAN,
Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER LANE, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 18-04510 BLF (PR)

**ORDER OF SERVICE; DIRECTING
DEFENDANTS TO FILE
DISPOSITIVE MOTION OR
NOTICE REGARDING SUCH
MOTION; INSTRUCTIONS TO
CLERK**

Plaintiff, a California inmate, filed the instant *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against officers at the Humboldt County Correctional Facility. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* will be addressed in a separate order.

DISCUSSION

A. Standard of Review

A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the court must identify any cognizable claims and dismiss any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim

1 upon which relief may be granted or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune
2 from such relief. *See id.* § 1915A(b)(1),(2). Pro se pleadings must, however, be liberally
3 construed. *See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988).

4 To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential
5 elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was
6 violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the
7 color of state law. *See West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

8 **B. Plaintiff's Claims**

9 Plaintiff claims that on June 24, 2018, Defendant Deputy Twitchell grabbed his
10 "forearm/hand" through the tray slot and tazed him with a "tazer harnessed in hand."
11 (Compl. at 3.) Plaintiff claims that he was tazed again on July 1, 2018, this time by
12 Defendant Corporal Lane while Defendant Deputy Ayala was standing by. (*Id.*) Plaintiff
13 claims that Deputy Ayala owed him a duty of protection from excessive force but merely
14 "smiled afterwards and to others." (*Id.*) Plaintiff claims that "[b]oth relished in this tazing
15 with malicious sadistic evil illegal spirits." (*Id.*) Liberally construed, these allegations are
16 sufficient to state cognizable claims for excessive force and failure to protect prisoner's
17 safety. *See Whitley v. Albers*, 475 U.S. 312, 319 (1986); *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S.
18 825, 832-34, 837 (1994).

19
20 **CONCLUSION**

21 For the reasons state above, the Court orders as follows:

22 1. The Clerk of the Court shall mail a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for
23 Waiver of Service of Summons, two copies of the Waiver of Service of Summons, a copy
24 of the complaint, all attachments thereto, and a copy of this order upon **Defendants**
25 **Corporal Lane, Deputy Ayala, and Deputy Twitchell** at the **Humboldt County**
26 **Correctional Facility** (826 4th Street, Eureka, CA 95501). The Clerk shall also mail a
27 copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

3. No later than **ninety-one (91) days** from the date this order is filed, Defendants shall file a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with respect to the claims in the complaint found to be cognizable above.

b. In the event Defendants file a motion for summary judgment, the Ninth Circuit has held that Plaintiff must be concurrently provided the appropriate

1 warnings under *Rand v. Rowland*, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). See
2 *Woods v. Carey*, 684 F.3d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 2012).

3 4. Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion shall be filed with the Court
4 and served on Defendants no later than **twenty-eight (28) days** from the date Defendants'
5 motion is filed.

6 Plaintiff is also advised to read Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and
7 *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317 (1986) (holding party opposing summary judgment
8 must come forward with evidence showing triable issues of material fact on every essential
9 element of his claim). Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to file an opposition to
10 Defendants' motion for summary judgment may be deemed to be a consent by Plaintiff to
11 the granting of the motion, and granting of judgment against Plaintiff without a trial. See
12 *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam); *Brydges v. Lewis*, 18
13 F.3d 651, 653 (9th Cir. 1994).

14 5. Defendants *shall* file a reply brief no later than **fourteen (14) days** after
15 Plaintiff's opposition is filed.

16 6. The motion shall be deemed submitted as of the date the reply brief is due.
17 No hearing will be held on the motion unless the Court so orders at a later date.

18 7. All communications by the Plaintiff with the Court must be served on
19 Defendants, or Defendants' counsel once counsel has been designated, by mailing a true
20 copy of the document to Defendants or Defendants' counsel.

21 8. Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil
22 Procedure. No further court order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(a)(2) or Local
23 Rule 16-1 is required before the parties may conduct discovery.

24 9. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the
25 court informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's orders in a
26 timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to
27 prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

1 10. Extensions of time must be filed no later than the deadline sought to be
2 extended and must be accompanied by a showing of good cause.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 Dated: December 10, 2018



BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge